

Applicants provisionally elect to prosecute Group I, claims 1-23 drawn to a multi-database computer system containing compound data. Applicants also provisionally elect claim 3 as the species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is found to be allowable, with traverse.

The examiner alleged that "[s]pecies of compounds are cited in claims 3-13 which are generally separately analyzed and published and thus document the undue search burden if searched together." Applicants respectfully submit that only claims 3-9 are drawn to "chemical compounds." Claims 10-13 are drawn to "molecular targets." Accordingly, the requirement that Applicants select a single species of compound from claims 3-13 is improper. Should the Examiner be persuaded that the requirement was improper and subsequently require a selection of a type of molecular target from claims 10-13 in addition to the type of compound, Applicants provisionally elect claim 10 in addition to claim 3.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 4, 2002

By: 

Walter D. Davis, Jr.
Reg. No. 45,137

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

APPENDIX TO AMENDMENT OF OCTOBER 4, 2002

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

3. (Amended) The computer system of claim 1, wherein the chemical compounds include compounds with [no] known biological activity[or that have failed in tests].

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com